



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Crescenta Valley Water District	County	Los Angeles
Project Title	Crescenta Valley County Park Stormwater Recharge Facility Study	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 272,500.00

Project Description: The Proposal conducts a study to evaluate the feasibility of using portions of Crescenta Valley County Park to recharge stormwater runoff by installing surface water gauging stations, monitoring surface water that would be diverted for groundwater recharge, assessing soil conditions through monitoring wells and percolation tests and conducting site surveys.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	4
Schedule	4
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	38

- **GWMP or Program:** The project is located in the Verdugo Basin, which is within the adjudicated Upper Los Angeles River Area (ULARA). The title page of the Judgment is provided (dated January 26, 1979) as is the URL to the entire document.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant is proposing a study to gather data and geologic information to determine the feasibility of recharging Verdugo Basin with storm water and dry weather flow. Applicant fully addresses all required elements of this criterion, and provides relevant support as necessary, including: a complete, detailed description of the proposed project, including project goals and any needed facilities. Additionally, applicant provides substantial documentation supporting the technical merits of the project; clearly explains the relevance of the project to the "Watermaster's goals and objectives [from the Annual Report, ULARA Watermaster, 2010-2011]"; describes the quality and usefulness of the information that will be obtained, using technically feasible methods, and specifically how the project will be used for the next phase (Phase II) of the project; and explains how ongoing use of the products derived from the proposed project (including how the soil infiltration testing data can be used by other agencies in the basin in planning for other recharge projects) will be funded after grant funds are expended. Specifically, the Study products- surface water gauges, groundwater modeling, infiltration galleries - will be included in applicant's annual maintenance and operations budget.
- **Work Plan:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant fully addresses all required elements of this criterion, including: providing a detailed discussion of work being proposed and what the product will be (including specific deliverables for each task, a sound strategy for evaluating progress and performance at each step of the proposed project, demonstrates that a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge will be obtained (and how this will improve groundwater management), and how information gained by the proposed project will be disseminated to the various stakeholders and other interested parties. Also, CEQA compliance and property access needs were discussed. CEQA compliance is anticipated to require an MND. Permits or access agreements will be needed with two agencies: Los Angeles (LA) Parks & Recreation (project location), and LA County Public Works Department for channel access (to install and maintain channel gauges, etc.).



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Budget:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. Tasks 2.4 and 3.4 include \$65,000 in Contractor fees, but an explanation to substantiate these lump sums, as required by the PSP was not found. Applicant fully addresses all other required elements of this criterion, including: providing a detailed budget table (that includes labor categories, estimated labor hours, hourly rates, and expenses) for all other tasks, that is consistent with and supported by the work plan and schedule, and identification of other sources of funding, by task (such as the \$22,500 funding match indicated, which will be provided by in-kind services).
- **Schedule:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. Applicant does not include an explanation of how obstacles would be resolved to keep on schedule. Otherwise, applicant addresses all other required elements of this criterion, including providing: a detailed realistic schedule showing the timeline for each task shown on the work plan and budget; assurances that the project will be ready to proceed when funding is secured; and an explanation of how the schedule was derived (based on previous experience in the completion of similar tasks). Applicant provides the required information in the form of detailed explanatory text as well as a Gantt chart. The project is proposed to start in June 2013 (allowing applicant to secure necessary outside support for the project).
- **QA/QC:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant demonstrates that appropriate and well-defined QA/QC measures will be implemented for each task, including: Using staff with appropriate qualifications (appropriately licensed and/or experienced) for the assigned Task (such as a Licensed California Land surveyor for Task 4); ensuring that all equipment is calibrated to specific manufacturer standards (including sampling equipment); analytical testing by EPA and California Certified Analytical Laboratory); Geologic logging that is to be completed by a certified hydrogeologist under the direction of a California Professional Geologist and according to industry standards. In addition to the detailed QA/QC procedures specified in Att. 8, QA/QC measures are consistent and incorporated, as appropriate, into the project work plan as required by the PSP.
- **Past Performance:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant fully addresses all required elements of this criterion, including: demonstrating, through completed grant work, the capability to perform high quality work, managing funds, and meeting deadlines for similar types of projects; and providing specific examples of how tasks and projects were completed on time and on budget. Supporting documentation for three previously awarded LGA grants include (from DWR): two complimentary performance evaluation letters and a letter acknowledging final project completion.